

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 633

VT 016 751

TITLE The Job Search of Ghetto Workers.
INSTITUTION Bureau of Labor Statistics (DOL), New York, N. Y.
PUB DATE Jun 71
NOTE 42p.; Regional Report No. 21

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Groups; Employment; *Employment Opportunities; *Information Sources; *Occupational Information; Statistical Surveys; Urban Slums

IDENTIFIERS *New York City

ABSTRACT

This fourth report in a series summarizing findings from the Urban Employment Survey examines how jobseekers living in the major poverty areas of New York City go about looking for work. The survey was designed to develop information on employment, unemployment, and work-related problems of the working-age population in these areas. The data discussed in this report cover the jobseeking methods used by 48,000 persons 16 years of age and over who were unemployed or looking for better jobs in the year ending June 1969. Sources of job information used included newspapers, public and private employment agencies, community organizations, and inquiries to employers, friends, and relatives. The methods most frequently used tended to be direct application to employers, inquiries to friends and relatives, and newspaper want ads. Figures on the persons, areas, occupations, and jobseeking methods used are detailed in this report. (MF)

ED 068633

REGIONAL REPORTS

NUMBER 21

JUNE 1971

POVERTY AREA

THE SEARCH OF GHETTO WORKERS

Bedford-Stuyvesant

Central Harlem

East Harlem

South Bronx

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
MIDDLE ATLANTIC REGIONAL OFFICE
341 NINTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10001

VT016751

This report is the twenty-first in a series of Regional Reports presenting and analyzing data on various aspects of labor and the economy in the Middle Atlantic Region. Earlier reports in this series are:

- No. 1 Profile 90: An analysis of Pockets of High Unemployment in New York City. August 1963 *
- No. 2 Wages 1963: Report on a Survey of Wages, Salaries, and Fringe Benefits for the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of New York, New York. October 1963*
- No. 3 Jobs in the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Area. December 1964*
- No. 4 Employment Statistics for the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Metropolitan Area, 1949-64. July 1965*
- No. 5 Seasonally Adjusted Employment Statistics for the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Metropolitan Area, 1949-64. August 1965*
- No. 6 1966 Major Collective Bargaining in the Middle Atlantic States. February 1966*
- No. 7 Post World War II Price Trends in Rent and Housing in the New York-Metropolitan Area. June 1967*
- No. 8 Employment Statistics, 1958-66: A Compilation of Employment Statistics for the Middle Atlantic Region. June 1968*
- No. 9 Labor Force Experience of the Puerto Rican Worker. June 1968
- No. 10 Changing Patterns of Employment, Income, and Living Standards in New York City. June 1968*
- No. 11 Professional, Administrative, and Technical Pay in New York, 1968. March 1969*
- No. 12 Charting the New York City Economy: A Graphic Summary of Recent Economic Trends. May 1969*
- No. 13 Urban Studies Series: Poverty Area Profiles. The Working Age Population - Initial Findings. October 1969*
- No. 14 Urban Studies Series: Poverty Area Profiles. Characteristics of the Unemployed. May 1970
- No. 15 Professional, Administrative, and Technical Pay in New York, 1969. June 1970*
- No. 16 Wages in the Virgin Islands, 1970. November 1970
- No. 17 A Price Index of Operating Costs for Uncontrolled Apartment Houses in New York City. February 1971
- No. 18 Professional, Administrative, and Technical Pay in New York, 1970. February 1971
- No. 19 Poverty Area Profiles: The New York Puerto Rican: Patterns of Work Experience. May 1971
- No. 20 Changing Patterns of Prices, Pay, Workers and Work on the New York Scene. May 1971

* Out of print. May be referred to at the Bureau's New York Office.

ED 068633

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE JOB SEARCH OF GHETTO WORKERS



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

J.D. Hodgson, Secretary

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
Geoffrey H. Moore, Commissioner

MIDDLE ATLANTIC REGIONAL OFFICE
Herbert Bienstock, Director


Preface

This is the fourth of a series of analytical reports on findings from the Urban Employment Survey. The survey was begun in July 1968, and was conducted for two years in major poverty areas of New York City. These poverty areas included Central and East Harlem, the South Bronx, and the Bedford-Stuyvesant section in Brooklyn.

The Urban Employment Survey was designed to develop information on employment, unemployment, and work-related problems of the working-age population residing in the poverty areas of major metropolitan centers -- Atlanta, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, and New York. The survey was directed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the cooperation and financing of the Manpower Administration. Data collection and tabulation were carried out by the Bureau of the Census.

The initial results of the Urban Employment Survey in New York City for the July 1968-June 1969 period were presented in Regional Report No. 13. The characteristics of unemployed workers residing in the City's poverty areas were analyzed in Regional Report No. 14. Regional Report No. 19 dealt with Puerto Rican workers residing in these areas. The present report examines how jobseekers residing in New York City's major poverty areas go about looking for work.

The report was prepared in the Division of Program and Analysis under the direction of Samuel M. Ehrenhalt, Deputy Regional Director. It was written by Horst Brand, under the general supervision of Jesse Benjamin.


Herbert Bienstock
Regional Director

Contents

	Page
Summary	1
Who were the jobseekers?	5
Major channels of job information and placement	8
Jobseeker characteristics and jobseeking methods	10
Effectiveness of jobseeking methods	17
Reports and publications	26
Concepts in this report	27
Technical note	30
Maps of New York City Urban Employment Survey areas	33

POVERTY AREA PROFILES
THE JOB SEARCH OF GHETTO WORKERS

How do people go about looking for work? What are the labor-force and other characteristics of persons who use various jobseeking methods? How effective are the job information sources they use in locating work? These are among the questions made relevant by the high levels of unemployment and underemployment experienced by those who live in the major poverty neighborhoods of New York City and other urban centers.

In view of the manpower shortages during the latter half of the 1960's, it seemed evident that the process of matching jobs and jobseekers from poverty neighborhoods did not operate so as to reduce their jobless rates to the New York City or national level: during the first full-year period when the Urban Employment Survey was conducted (July 1968-June 1969), the unemployment rate of workers residing in these neighborhoods was two to three times as high as the overall rate for the City or the Nation.

Inadequate information about available job openings, or ignorance of the sources of such information, has long been thought to be among the barriers preventing poverty-area jobseekers from improving their economic situation. For this reason, a series of questions pertaining to jobseeking methods was included in the Urban Employment Survey.

The data discussed in this report cover 48,000 persons 16 years of age and over, who looked for work at some time during the year

preceding the interview. Most of these jobseekers had experienced unemployment during the year, but about one fifth were workers with year-round jobs who had had no unemployment and who were evidently trying to improve their economic status by finding another job.

Jobseekers from the City's poverty areas used diverse sources for leads in their search for work. These sources included the State Employment Service, newspapers, private employment agencies, community organizations (such as welfare agencies, the Urban League and community action groups), direct application to a potential employer, and inquiries with relatives or friends. Other, numerically less important, methods of looking for work included union registers and waiting on special street corners in the hope of being picked up by an employer.

Jobseekers did not confine themselves to any one of these methods; on average, they used three of them in their search for work. The methods they tended to use most frequently were direct application to an employer, inquiries with relatives or friends, want ads, and the State Employment Service.

Among the age, sex, and labor force characteristics of jobseekers from the City's major poverty neighborhoods were the following:

... Nearly half of all jobseekers were young men and women 16-24 years old, about the same proportion as among the unemployed who resided in these neighborhoods during the survey period. Half of all jobseekers 25 and over were women. Thus, the majority of jobseekers belonged to age-sex groups whose attachment to the labor force tends to be less firm than that of adult men.

... The occupational distribution of jobseekers did not differ significantly from that of the civilian labor force in the City's poverty areas. Thirty-six percent held white-collar jobs in their present or last job (mostly in clerical or sales fields); 37 percent were blue-collar workers (mainly in semiskilled and unskilled lines); and 19 percent were service workers. Eight percent had never worked.

... The race-ethnic distribution of jobseekers was about in line with that of the unemployed. Just under two-thirds were Negro, and about one-fourth were of Puerto Rican birth or parentage.

... Work experience of jobseekers during the year preceding the interview differed from that of all persons with work experience in the City's poverty areas. Nearly four-fifths of all jobseekers had been employed for only part of the year, compared with one-third of all poverty-area residents with work experience who had worked as well as looked for work.

Among jobseeker characteristics which tended to influence the choice of jobseeking methods were the following:

... Age. Older adults (25 and over) were more likely than young adults or teenagers to use the State Employment Service or private employment agencies in their search for work. This finding may in part be related to the fact that the great majority of unemployment insurance beneficiaries come from older age groups. A much larger proportion of the younger than of the older men used community organizations.

... Occupation. Jobseekers whose present or last job was in white-collar fields were somewhat more likely than blue-collar or service workers to scan want ads in looking for work, reflecting the impor-

tance of New York City newspapers as channels of white-collar job information.

... Work experience. A high proportion of jobseekers with 14-49 weeks of work experience during the year preceding the interview (most of whom had probably experienced some unemployment) had consulted with the State Employment Service. Jobseekers with 1-14 weeks of work experience -- primarily teenagers and young adults -- were less likely to have used the Service. A much greater proportion of them than of other jobseekers had used community organizations. The choice of other jobseeking methods was in general not significantly affected by work experience.

Formal channels of job information or placement, such as the State Employment Service, newspaper want ads, private employment agencies, or community organizations, tended to be less important in finding work than informal channels, such as direct application to employers or inquiries with relatives or friends. This is borne out by the following findings.

... Nearly half of all jobseekers who had had work experience during the year preceding the interview had found their present or last job through informal job leads, as compared with little more than one-third who found their jobs through formal channels. (A small proportion of jobseekers had used other methods, not classifiable as formal or informal.)

... Teenage jobseekers were less likely than adults to have found work through the State Employment Service, and more likely to have gotten a job through a community organization.

... Puerto Rican jobseekers were less likely than their Negro counterparts to have located work through formal sources of job information or **placement**. For example, 28 percent of all Puerto Rican jobseekers, as against 40 percent of Negro jobseekers, found work through these formal channels.

... When the total number of jobseekers who used a given method was related to the number who located work through that method, the results suggested that formal channels of job information or placement tended to be somewhat less effective than informal ones. For example, one-fifth of all male jobseekers who had used formal channels actually got their jobs through them; in contrast, close to one-third of all male jobseekers who had used informal sources of job leads found work that way.

Who were the jobseekers?

Forty-eight thousand men and women from the City's major poverty areas had looked for a job during the year preceding the interview or were looking for one at the time it took place. Just under 38,000 had experienced unemployment during the previous 12 months or were currently unemployed; most of the other 10,000 were year-round, full-time workers who had not been jobless and who were probably looking for another job to improve their economic status. Of the 38,000 jobseekers who had been or currently were unemployed, 30,000 had worked or currently held a job; the remainder had found no work.

The age distribution of poverty-area jobseekers was similar to that of the currently unemployed from these areas (see Table 1). Close to one-half of all jobseekers were young men and women, 16-24 years old -- persons who were more likely than older adults to be unemployed at some

Table 1. Age and sex of jobseekers residing
in major New York City poverty areas,
July 1968-June 1969

Age and sex	: Total : 1/	: Negro	: Puerto : Rican
Total, 16 and over	48,000	30,700	11,700
Percent distribution .	100	100	100
16-19	28	29	30
20-24	19	20	17
25-44	36	33	40
45 and over	17	18	12
<u>Men</u>			
Total, 16 and over	25,700	14,700	7,200
Percent distribution .	100	100	100
16-19	30	33	29
20-24	18	18	15
25-44	36	31	45
45 and over	17	18	10
<u>Women</u>			
Total, 16 and over	22,300	16,000	4,500
Percent distribution .	100	100	<u>2/</u>
16-19	26	25	-
20-24	20	22	-
25-44	35	35	-
45 and over	18	18	-

1/ Total includes whites, not shown separately.
The number of white male jobseekers was 3,800
and the number of white female jobseekers was
1,900.

2/ Percent not shown where base is less than 5,000.

time during the year, and also to be in the labor force only part of the year. Nearly half of the jobseekers 25 and over were women, whose labor force attachment also may often be less firm than that of men, and who tend to exit from or re-enter the labor force more frequently than men.

In regard to occupation of present or last job, jobseekers did not differ significantly from the civilian labor force residing in the City's poverty neighborhoods. Thirty-six percent were white-collar workers (mostly in clerical and sales fields); 37 percent were blue-collar workers (mainly in semiskilled and unskilled lines); and 19 percent were service workers. Eight percent had never worked, mostly new labor force entrants.

The distribution of jobseekers by race or ethnic origin corresponded roughly with that for unemployment in the City's poverty areas. Just below two-thirds were Negro, about one-fourth were of Puerto Rican birth or parentage, and the remainder were white. Somewhat more Negro women than Negro men were jobseekers. Negro women (20-64) heading households accounted for about as large a proportion of all Negro jobseekers as male household heads (one in every five). Fewer than two-fifths of all Puerto Rican jobseekers were women (see Table 1).

The work experience of jobseekers from the City's major poverty areas differed considerably from that of all persons with work experience from these areas. Nearly four-fifths of all jobseekers with work experience during the year preceding the interview had been employed for only part of the year, as compared with one-third of all poverty-area residents who had worked or looked for work (see also Table 2). Part-year work experience was typical for full-time as well as for part-time jobseekers. Differences between Negroes and Puerto Ricans were not significant.

Table 2. Work experience^{1/} of jobseekers and of all persons, 16 and over, in year preceding interview, major New York City poverty areas, July 1968-June 1969

Work experience	: Jobseekers :	Total with work experience
Total number of persons	48,000 ^{2/}	234,000
Worked full time	32,900	207,000
Percent distribution ...	100	100
1-26 weeks	39	13
27-49 weeks	33	16
50-52 weeks	28	71
Worked part time	7,600	27,100
Percent distribution ...	100	100
1-26 weeks	59	40
27-49 weeks	23	22
50-52 weeks	18	38

^{1/} Work experience refers to employment at some time during the year preceding the interview.

^{2/} Includes persons who looked but did not find work, representing 16 percent of all jobseekers.

Part-year work experience of most jobseekers mainly reflected movements into and out of the labor force during the course of the year, and these were largely related to the preponderance of women and young adults or teenagers among jobseekers. One-fifth of all jobseekers had looked for work at some time during the previous 12 months although they were not in the labor force when they were interviewed.

Major channels of job information and placement

Jobseekers residing in the City's major poverty neighborhoods were asked 12 questions about their jobseeking activities during the year

preceding the interview. Nine of these questions pertained to specific sources or channels of job information or placement; they were --

Did you check with the State Employment Service during the past 12 months?

Did you apply directly to an employer?

Did you ask your friends or relatives?

Did you check the newspapers?

During the past 12 months, did you register with any union?

Did you check with a private employment agency, one supported by fees?


Did you check with organizations such as community action groups, Urban League, and welfare agencies?

Did you go to special streets or places where employers come to pick up workers? (Asked only of men)

Did you use any other way to look for a job in the past 12 months? What other way did you use?

Jobseekers generally used three methods in looking for work. Those most frequently used were (1) direct application to a potential employer; (2) inquiry with relatives or friends; and (3) newspaper want ads. These three sources of job leads accounted for over 60 percent of the total of 144,400 sources reported. That proportion did not vary significantly by race or ethnic composition of jobseekers (see Chart 1 and Table 3).

The State Employment Service accounted for a somewhat smaller proportion of jobseeking methods than any of the three other major methods, in part perhaps because jobseekers who were not drawing unemployment



insurance benefits did not use it as frequently. Private employment agencies and community organizations (such as the Urban League, welfare agencies, and community action groups) accounted for less than one-tenth each of all channels used.

Jobseeker characteristics and jobseeking methods

The proportion of jobseekers using specific jobseeking methods varied somewhat by personal and social characteristics. Jobseekers tended to differ by age and sex, labor force status, occupation, and work experience insofar as they used formal methods of looking for work --

Table 3. Jobseeking methods used by residents of
major New York City poverty areas,
July 1968-June 1969

Method	: Total : : 1/ :	Negro	:Puerto :Rican
Number of methods used	144,400	94,900	33,400
Percent distribution	100	100	100
State Employment Service	15	16	14
Newspapers	19	19	19
Private employment agencies	7	7	6
Community organizations 2/	7	9	5
Direct application to employer ...	23	23	23
Inquiry with relatives or friends.	21	20	23
All other methods 3/.....	8	6	10

1/ Total includes methods used by whites, not shown separately.

2/ Includes such community organizations as welfare agencies, the Urban League and community action groups.

3/ Includes registering with a union, waiting on special street corners to be picked up by an employer, and other methods.

such as the State Employment Service, private employment agencies, and community organizations. But they differed relatively little in terms of their characteristics when they used informal methods -- such as direct application to an employer or inquiries with relatives to an employer or inquiries with relatives or friends.

Age and sex. Male teenagers and young adults (20-24) were less likely than older adults (25 and over) to use the State Employment Service or private employment agencies in their search for work (see Table 4). The great majority of unemployment insurance beneficiaries come from the

Table 4. Jobseeking methods by age and sex of jobseekers,
major New York City poverty areas,
July 1968-June 1969

Method 1/	: 16 and : over	: 16-24	: 25 and : over
<u>Men</u>			
Number of jobseekers	25,700	12,200	13,600
<u>Percent of jobseekers using method</u>			
Formal methods			
State Employment Service	49	40	57
Newspapers	58	60	57
Private employment agencies	23	16	30
Community organizations	22	33	13
Informal methods			
Direct application to employer	71	70	72
Inquiry with relatives or friends ...	69	69	67
<u>Women</u>			
Number of jobseekers	22,300	10,300	11,900
<u>Percent of jobseekers using method</u>			
Formal methods			
State Employment Service	43	40	46
Newspapers	57	53	61
Private employment agencies	21	20	22
Community organizations	22	25	18
Informal methods			
Direct application to employer	66	70	64
Inquiry with relatives or friends ...	58	60	57

1/ Jobseekers used a small proportion of methods not shown.
NOTE: Jobseekers generally used more than one method.

older age groups, and this may in part explain why a larger proportion of the older than of the younger jobseekers consulted the State Employment Service in looking for work. Private employment agencies, oriented to more experienced workers in their placement activities, might therefore be used less by younger jobseekers than by older ones. In contrast, a much larger proportion of the younger than of older men used community organizations, such as welfare agencies, the Urban League or community action groups; one-third of the former did so, as against one-eighth of the latter. These organizations are generally more attuned to aiding youths and young adults in training for, and seeking, jobs.

Among women, age differences did not significantly affect the choice of jobseeking method. A smaller proportion of older female than of older male jobseekers used the State Employment Service -- even though female unemployment insurance beneficiaries outnumber their male counterparts in New York City. A possible reason for this paradox is that the occupational mix of female jobseekers from the City's poverty neighborhoods, being strongly weighted towards service work, differs from that of female beneficiaries, among whom factory workers predominate.

Current labor force status. Currently unemployed persons were somewhat more likely to have used the State Employment Service than currently employed persons or nonparticipants during the course of the year preceding the interview. Community organizations were consulted more heavily by jobseekers who were not currently in the labor force than by others, reflecting in the main the jobseeking practices of Negro teenagers and young adults. In most other respects, jobseeking methods were not significantly affected by labor force status (see Table 5).

Table 5. Jobseeking methods by current labor force status
major New York City poverty areas,
July 1968-June 1969

Method ^{1/}	: Employed :	Un- : employed :	Not in : labor force
Number of jobseekers	25,100	13,400	9,600
<u>Percent of jobseekers using method</u>			
Formal methods			
State Employment Service	43	56	43
Newspapers	59	54	59
Private employment agencies	25	22	15
Community organizations	18	19	38
Informal methods			
Direct application to employer	66	73	70
Inquiry with relatives or friends .	58	69	68

^{1/} Jobseekers used a small proportion of methods not shown.

NOTE: Jobseekers generally used more than one method.

Occupation. Jobseekers whose present or last job was in a white-collar occupation were somewhat more likely than blue-collar or service workers to scan want ads in looking for work, reflecting the importance of New York City newspapers as white-collar labor market intermediaries. Service workers evidently were somewhat more inclined than other occupational groups to consult with the State Employment Service or private employment agencies in their job search, in part perhaps because of the role these channels play in placing domestics and other service-type personnel (see Table 6).

Work experience. The relationships that emerge when jobseeking methods are classified by the work experience of jobseekers during the year preceding the interview probably reflect age and degree of

Table 6. Jobseeking methods by occupation,
major New York City poverty areas,
July 1968-June 1969

Method <u>1/</u>	: White : collar	: Blue : collar	: Service
Number of jobseekers	17,400	17,800	8,900
<u>Percent of jobseekers using method</u>			
Formal methods			
State Employment Service	43	47	53
Newspapers	66	54	52
Private employment agencies	24	19	29
Community organizations	25	18	19
Informal methods			
Direct application to employer	70	71	64
Inquiry with relatives or friends .	57	68	61

1/ Jobseekers used a small proportion of methods not shown.
NOTE: Jobseekers generally used more than one method.

experience. Thus, a high proportion of jobseekers who worked 1-14 weeks had used community organizations, and they were evidently mostly teenagers and young adults. A relatively small proportion of full-time, year-round workers consulted with the State Employment Service. Few if any of these workers were entitled to unemployment insurance benefits and in contrast to part-year workers with 14-49 weeks of work experience, had less occasion to visit the Service's offices. Not surprisingly perhaps, the pattern of jobseeking methods of persons with no work experience, most of whom were teenagers or adult women, was similar to that of part-time workers (see Table 7).

Table 7. Jobseeking methods by work experience,
major New York City poverty areas, July 1968-June 1969

Method 1/	Full-time			Part- time	No work ex- perience
	1-13 : weeks	14-49 : weeks	50-52 : weeks		
Number of jobseekers	6,600	11,900	9,100	7,600	7,500
Percent of jobseekers using method					
State Employment Service	45	60	34	41	48
Newspapers	62	62	55	49	56
Private employment agencies .	14	25	21	21	16
Community organizations	33	21	12	29	24
Direct application to employer	74	75	67	67	64
Inquiry with relatives or friends	74	71	53	57	68

1/ Jobseekers used a small proportion of methods not shown.

NOTE: Jobseekers generally used more than one method.

The above discussion indicates that some jobseeker characteristics and some jobseeking methods tend to be related. Jobseeker characteristics, however, do not necessarily determine the selection of jobseeking methods. Each method may be conceived as incorporating a series of screening devices, which channel -- or block -- a jobseeker according to his personal or social characteristics. The State Employment Service or private employment agencies, for example, list job vacancies suitable for various age groups, requiring a range of skill and experience. Leads given by relatives or friends are likely to refer to jobs which suit the jobseeker's age, sex, and experience, even if they may not take account of his potential. Direct application to an employer entails an analogous screening process on the part of the jobseeker, who is likely to select employers whose requirements he believes he can match.

Thus, it seems likely that, regardless of their personal or social characteristics, jobseekers relied on the knowledge that each major jobseeking method consists of an array of screening devices through which they might be channeled to suitable jobs.

No firm conclusions can be drawn as to the impact of unemployment experience on the selection of jobseeking methods. Twenty-seven percent of all poverty-area teenagers and young adults (20-24) who had work experience during the year preceding the interview also reported some unemployment experience, as did 13 percent of the older adults (25 and over). Perhaps the relatively greater use of community organizations made by the younger groups is in part linked to its heavier unemployment experience. It should be noted, too, however, that 16-24 year old jobseekers used, on average, about as many methods as older jobseekers. Also, as a proportion of all the methods they used, community organizations accounted for only 10 percent.

Jobseeking methods	Age groups of jobseekers	
	16-24	25 and over
Total methods	65,900	78,500
Percent distribution	100	100
State Employment Service	14	17
Newspapers	19	19
Private employment agencies	6	8
Community organizations	10	5
Direct application to employer	24	22
Inquiry with relatives or friends ..	22	20
All other methods	5	9

Effectiveness of jobseeking methods

In addition to being queried about the methods used currently in looking for work, the nearly 41,000 jobseekers in the City's poverty

areas who had been employed in the 12 months preceding the interview were asked, "Which way of looking for work got you your present (or most recent) job?"

Nearly half of these jobseekers had located work through informal sources of job information. Two out of every five of the adults (20 and over) had successfully used leads supplied through formal channels, but only one out of four teenagers had obtained work through such channels; among these, community organizations were by far the most important. Puerto Rican jobseekers were somewhat less likely than their Negro counterparts to have obtained work through formal methods, and more likely to have found it by inquiring with relatives or friends (see Chart II and Table 8).




Table 8. Jobseeking methods used for present or last job,
major New York City poverty areas, July 1968-June 1969

Method	:Both sexes, :16 and over:	:Both sexes, 16-19	: Men, 20 : and over	:Women, 20 : and over
<u>Total, all persons 1/</u>				
Total 2/	40,600	11,500	15,700	13,400
Percent distribution	100	100	100	100
Formal methods	35	25	36	42
State Employment Service ...	12	6	11	18
Newspapers	7	3	7	10
Private employment agencies.	7	4	8	7
Community organizations	5	12	2	3
Union register	4	-	7	4
Informal methods	49	54	48	47
Applied to employer	27	30	25	28
Inquired with relatives or friends	22	24	23	19
All other methods	15	20	16	12
<u>Negro</u>				
Total 2/	25,600	7,500	8,700	9,500
Percent distribution	100	100	100	100
Formal methods	40	31	39	49
State Employment Service ...	16	8	16	25
Newspapers	7	4	8	9
Private employment agencies.	7	4	7	9
Community organizations	7	15	3	3
Union register	3	-	5	3
Informal methods	44	50	47	39
Applied to employer	25	29	24	24
Inquired with relatives or friends	19	21	23	15
All other methods	16	21	15	13

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 8. Jobseeking methods used for present or last job,
major New York City poverty areas, July 1968-June 1969 (Continued)

Method	:Both sexes, :16 and over:	:Both sexes, 16-19	: Men, 20 : and over	:Women, 20 : and over
<u>Puerto Rican</u>				
Total ^{2/}	9,800	3,000	4,400	2,400
Percent distribution	100	<u>3/</u>	<u>3/</u>	<u>3/</u>
Formal methods	28			
State Employment Service ...	8			
Newspapers	7			
Private employment agencies.	3			
Community organizations	4			
Union register	6			
Informal methods	58			
Applied to employer	28			
Inquired with relatives or friends	30			
All other methods	15			

^{1/} Includes Whites, not shown separately.

^{2/} Excludes jobseekers who did not work during year preceding interview.

^{3/} Percent not shown where base is less than 5,000.

Since the number of jobseekers who used a given method in looking for work invariably exceeded the number who had found work through that method, a measure gauging the method's effectiveness may be devised. For example, 11,000 jobseekers, 16 and over, had found a job by directly applying to an employer, while a total of 33,000 had used this method as one among several to look for a job; $(11,000/33,000) \times 100 = 33$ percent. This was the highest proportion for any of the major jobseeking methods. The effectiveness of other jobseeking methods ranged downward from 29 percent for inquiries with relatives or friends to 22 percent for the State Employment Service, and 11 percent for newspaper want ads (see Table 9).

The measures of effectiveness discussed here and indicated in Table 9 should be interpreted with caution, since the reference period for the numerator may differ from that for the denominator. The denominator -- the total number of persons who used a given jobseeking method -- refers to the 12 months preceding the interview. The numerator refers to the period when respondents got their present or last job, which may have occurred at any time in the past. Thus, numerator and denominator are not strictly comparable.

Table 9 confirms a pattern suggested in Table 8, namely, that informal ways of looking for work were more likely to succeed than the use of formal sources of job information. Around one fifth of all jobseekers from the City's poverty neighborhoods found a job through such formal channels as the State Employment Service, newspapers, private employment agencies, or a union register, as compared with nearly one-third who used informal contacts, such as direct application to an

Table 9. Effectiveness of jobseeking methods,
major New York City poverty areas, July 1968-June 1969

Method	: Number : using : method ^{1/}	: Number having : found work : through method ^{2/}	: Ratio
<u>Males, 16 and over</u>			
Formal methods	42,200	7,600	18
State Employment Service	12,600	2,400	19
Newspapers	15,000	1,400	9
Community organizations	5,700	1,100	19
Private employment agencies	5,900	1,500	25
Union register	3,000	1,200	<u>3/</u>
Informal methods	35,700	10,900	31
Direct application to employer	18,300	5,800	32
Inquiry with relatives or friends	17,400	5,100	29
<u>Females, 16 and over</u>			
Formal methods	33,300	7,000	21
State Employment Service	9,700	2,600	27
Newspapers	12,700	1,600	13
Private employment agencies	4,600	1,300	<u>3/</u>
Community organizations	4,800	1,100	<u>3/</u>
Union register	1,500	400	<u>3/</u>
Informal methods	27,800	9,000	32
Direct application with employer	14,800	5,200	35
Inquiry with relatives or friends	13,000	3,800	29

^{1/} During year preceding interview.

^{2/} At any time in the past for present or last job.

^{3/} Percent not shown where base is less than 5,000.

NOTE: Jobseekers also used a small proportion of methods not shown here and not included in formal or informal methods.

employer or leads from relatives or friends. The difference in job-finding success between formal and informal methods was somewhat more pronounced among teenagers and young adults than among persons 25 and over, reflecting mainly the importance of directly applying to an employer among the younger men. Some of the reasons why jobseeking methods varied in effectiveness are suggested in what follows.

Proportion of jobseekers finding job
through method shown

	Formal methods	Informal methods
Men, 16-24	16	34
25 and over	20	28
Women, 16-24	17	34
25 and over	24	31

State Employment Service. Less than half of the 48,000 jobseekers from the City's poverty neighborhoods reported having used the Service as one of a number of methods to find work; little more than one fifth of these users said they had been placed through the Service. Some respondents may have erroneously told the UES interviewer that they got their present or last job by applying directly to an employer even though actually they had been referred by the Service. This factor possibly contributed to what appears to be the somewhat low ratio for the Service in relation to its use as a jobseeking method.

Newspapers. Nearly three-fifths of all jobseekers checked want ads in their search for work, but little more than one-tenth of those who had done so found a job that way. The wide discrepancy between the use and the effectiveness of newspapers as a jobseeking method may be explained, on the one hand, by their being easily accessible and, on the

other, by their advertising types of jobs that relate predominantly to white-collar fields, while most jobseekers from poverty neighborhoods were blue-collar or service oriented.

Private employment agencies. Only about one-fifth of all jobseekers registered with fee-for-service employment agencies; more than one-fourth of these registrants were placed. The level of effectiveness of these agencies may be related to their known selectivity in placing applicants. Many jobseekers probably screened themselves "out" to begin with, and did not bother to register with them.

Community organizations. One fifth of all jobseekers used community organizations, such as welfare agencies, the Urban League, community action groups, and similar organizations -- but only about 20 percent of such users found work through them. However, this does not fully reflect the effectiveness of these organizations since they sponsored training programs for an unknown number of the respondents who, as a result of having participated in such programs, may have looked for and found work through other channels.

Direct application to employer. More than two-thirds of all jobseekers applied directly to an employer as one of the methods they used in looking for work, and one-third of those who did so found placement. The relatively favorable experience of jobseekers in finding work through this method may in part have stemmed from selectivity in applying for what were likely to be suitable jobs at reasonably accessible locations, which in turn facilitated employers' screening of applicants. Matching of jobseeker and job was thus smoothed. Response errors may, however, also account in part for the high proportion of successful

jobseekers who applied at personnel offices: some respondents may have actually been referred by the State Employment Service or relatives or friends.

Relatives or friends. More than three-fifths of all jobseekers inquired with relatives or friends about job opportunities, and nearly 30 percent of those who did so located work that way. The reasons for the relative effectiveness of this source of job information would seem similar to those cited for direct application to employers. Job leads furnished by relatives or friends are likely in many cases to be based on reliable information (including personal requests by an employer to help find someone to fill an opening). Relatives and friends may frequently be good judges of a jobseeker's qualifications, ensuring a high degree of suitability for a given vacancy. However, by the same token, the use of relatives and friends as job information sources can also restrict job opportunities if the jobs they hold or know about are mainly dead-end, low-status positions.

Follow-up. The effectiveness of a given jobseeking method was probably influenced by the relation between the method and follow-up. (A respondent did not have to have followed up on a jobseeking activity to be reported as having used it.) A jobseeking method such as direct application to an employer may require little or no follow-up, and this may enhance its effectiveness. Follow-up on a lead from relatives or friends may be facilitated by the knowledge or belief that a suitable or even a congenial opening exists. On the other hand, the impersonal setting of the State Employment Service, combined with ignorance of the Service's counseling functions, may at times inhibit follow-up; and the

follow-up activity usually required when want ads are used in looking for work may be too complex and time-consuming for some jobseekers.

Reports and publications

This is the fourth report on findings from the Urban Employment Survey in New York City's major poverty areas, issued by the Middle Atlantic Regional Office of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Other reports on major aspects of UES findings are planned, and will be forthcoming as staff resources permit.

Copies of this report are available without charge from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Middle Atlantic Regional Office, 341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York, 10001. Related reports include:
Regional Report No. 13, Poverty Area Profiles: The Working Age Population:

Initial Findings.*

Regional Report No. 14, Poverty Area Profiles: Characteristics of the Unemployed.*

Regional Report No. 19, Poverty Area Profiles: The Puerto Rican Worker
BLS Report No. 370, Employment Situation in Poverty Areas of Six Cities,
July 1968-June 1969.*

Reports have also been published by the five other cities where the Urban Employment Survey has been conducted -- in Atlanta, Detroit, Chicago, Houston, and Los Angeles.

* Out of print. Copies are on file for reference.

Concepts In This Report

Civilian noninstitutional population -- The population, 16 and over, residing in the New York City Urban Employment Survey area, exclusive of inmates of institutions, such as prisons and mental hospitals, and of members of the Armed Forces.

Employed persons -- Employed persons comprise (1) all civilians who, during the specified week, did any work at all as paid employees or in their own business or profession, or who worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers in a business operated by a member of the family, and (2) all those who were not working (but who had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent) because of illness, bad weather, vacation, or labor-management dispute, or because they were taking time off for personal reasons. Excluded from the employed group are persons whose only activity consisted of work around the house (such as own home housework, painting or repairing own home, etc.) or volunteer work for religious, charitable, and similar organizations.

Household head -- The head of household is the member reported as the head by the household respondent. Household heads are either heads of primary families or primary individuals. The head of a primary family is a household head living with one or more persons related to him by blood, marriage, or adoption. A primary individual is a household head living alone or with nonrelatives only.

Jobseekers -- Jobseekers are all persons, whether or not they are currently employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force, who looked for work at any time during the 12 months preceding the interview. Thus, currently employed persons may be looking for another job or they may have looked for a job at sometime prior to the interview, at a time when they may have been employed, or unemployed, or not in the labor force. Currently unemployed persons are jobseekers by definition, except for those on temporary layoff, who may not be looking for another job. Persons currently not in the labor force may have been in the labor force and looked for a job at some time during the previous year.

Jobseeking method used for present or last job -- refers to the method by which a jobseeker succeeded in finding his current job or the job he held prior to becoming unemployed or leaving the labor force.

Jobseeking methods -- A jobseeker may have used one or more ways of looking for work. Therefore, the number of methods exceeds the number of jobseekers. Jobseeking methods include the following:

Community organizations --

Community organizations -- A jobseeker may have contacted such private or public organizations as the Urban League, community action groups, or welfare agencies to obtain a job. A person participating in the training activities of such organizations is also considered a jobseeker.

Direct application to employer -- A person who inquired about work at the personnel office or the hiring gate of an employer or by mail or telephone is considered to have applied directly to employer.

Inquiry with relatives or friends -- This method involves the jobseeker's having asked friends or relatives about jobs they might know about.

Newspaper want ads -- Scanning of want ads in newspapers, whether or not the respondent followed up.

Special streetcorners -- Waiting at special places to be picked up by an employer is not uncommon among men in cities. It consists of an informal arrangement where a truck or car will go to a specified place (usually a street corner) and pick up a crew of men for a day's (or part of a day's) work. There may or may not be a day-to-day arrangement between the employer and the workers for pick-up.

State Employment Service -- The respondent need not have gone to main Employment Service office in order to be considered a jobseeker using this method. Any branch of the office represents a jobseeking method, such as an out-reach station, Youth Opportunity Center or even a small one-room office the Employment Service may have in a local community action headquarters, such as the Urban League. If the person went to the Employment Service primarily for unemployment insurance, he is still considered to be looking for work through the service.

Union register -- If a jobseeker was a union member, he may have placed his name on a register at a union hall.

Labor force -- The civilian labor force consists of the total of all civilians classified as "employed" or "unemployed" in accordance with the criteria described for these classifications.

Negro -- The designation "Negro" as used in the tables includes a small proportion of persons of races other than Negro or white.

Not in the civilian labor force -- All persons who are not classified as employed or unemployed are defined as "not in labor force."

Part-time and full-time workers -- Persons who worked 1 to 34 hours are designated as working part-time. Persons who worked 35 hours or more are considered full-time workers.

Puerto Rican -- Puerto Rican refers to all persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage.

Race or ethnic group -- The designation "Negro" includes a small percentage of persons of races other than Negro or white. "Puerto Rican" includes all persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage. "Negro" and "White" excludes Puerto Rican.

Unemployed -- Unemployed persons are those civilians who had no employment during the survey week, were available for work, and

- (1) had engaged in any specific jobseeking activity within the past four weeks. Principal activities include: registering at a public or private employment office; meeting with prospective employers; checking with friends or relatives; placing or answering advertisements; writing letters of application; or being on a union or professional register;
- (2) were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off, or
- (3) were waiting to report to a new wage or salary job scheduled to start within the following 30 days.

Unemployment rate -- The unemployment rate represents the number unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force.

White -- The designation "White" as used in this report excludes persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage.

Work experience -- Persons with work experience are civilians who worked at any time during the year preceding the interview at full-time or part-time jobs.

Part-time and full-time jobs -- Persons are classified as having worked at full-time jobs if they worked 35 hours or more per week and having worked at part-time jobs if they worked 1 to 34 hours per week.

Part-year workers -- Part-year workers are persons who worked either full time or part time for 1 to 49 weeks.

Weeks worked -- Persons with work experience are classified according to the number of weeks in which they did any work during the year for pay or profit (including paid vacations or sick leave) or worked without pay on a family-operated farm or business.

Year-round full-time workers -- Year-round full-time workers are persons who worked primarily at full-time jobs for 50 weeks or more.

Technical note

The data for the Urban Employment Survey in New York City, on which this report is based, were compiled from household surveys of persons, 16 and over, residing in the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) areas of Central and East Harlem, and the South Bronx. In addition, the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn was surveyed. The Urban Employment Survey was also conducted in major Atlanta, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, and Los Angeles poverty areas, and in the balance of the cities of Detroit and of Atlanta.

CEP areas are areas in which the Department of Labor has combined separate manpower programs in order to concentrate these programs in specific neighborhoods. The selection of CEP areas in New York as well as in the other UES cities was in large part based on the extent of unemployment and poverty in the areas as shown mostly by the 1960 Decennial Census.

The Urban Employment Survey was directed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the cooperation and financing of the Manpower Administration. The Bureau of the Census collected and tabulated the data. In New York City, the data were collected by trained Census Bureau interviewers from a sample of about 3,600 households residing in 151 Census tracts, maps of which may be found on the following pages.

Although the areas covered in this report are referred to as poverty neighborhoods it should be noted that they include persons and families who are not living in poverty conditions, and who do not have serious employment problems.

The racial or ethnic designations in this report are defined as follows: "Negro" excludes Puerto Ricans, and includes a small proportion of persons of races other than Negro or white. "Puerto Rican" refers to all persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage. "White" refers to all white persons other than Puerto Rican.

Reliability of the estimates

The estimates in this report and in the detailed tables that follow are based on a sample of 3,600 households, and they may differ from the figure that would have been obtained, had it been possible to take a complete census, using the same schedule and procedures. The design of the sample used provides the greatest reliability for data concerning broad population groups; estimates for small groups -- particularly where they fall below 5,000 -- will have larger relative sampling errors. Differences between such small estimates may be simply the result of sampling variability, and should therefore be interpreted with caution.

All statements of comparison made in the text of this report are statistically significant at a level of at least 1.6 times the standard error; that is, the chances are at least 9 out of 10 that a difference identified in the text indicates a true difference between estimates rather than the chance variations arising from the use of samples.

The standard error is a measure of sampling variability; it indicates the variations that might occur by chance because only a sample of the population was surveyed. The chances are about two out of three that an estimate from the sample would differ from a complete census by less than the standard error. The chances are about 9 out of 10 that the difference would be less than 1.6 times the standard error, and 19 out of 20 that it would be less than twice the standard error. The following tables show approximations of standard errors of the levels and of the rates and percentages presented in this report for the New York City Urban Employment Survey area.

Standard errors of level of the annual estimates
for the New York City Urban Employment Survey

Size of estimates	Standard error
5,000	560
10,000	800
20,000	1,150
30,000	1,400
40,000	1,600
60,000	2,400
120,000	3,000
160,000	3,500
200,000	4,100
240,000	4,600
280,000	5,100
320,000	5,500
360,000	6,000
400,000	6,400


Standard errors of level of the annual estimates of
percentages for the New York City Urban Employment Survey

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage						
	1 or 99	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	20 or 80	25 or 75	50
5,000	1.1	1.6	2.5	3.4	4.5	4.9	5.6
10,000	.8	1.1	1.7	2.4	3.2	3.4	4.0
20,000	.6	.8	1.2	1.7	2.3	2.4	2.8
30,000	.5	.7	1.0	1.4	1.8	2.0	2.3
40,000	.4	.6	.8	1.1	1.6	1.6	1.9
60,000	.3	.4	.6	.8	1.1	1.2	1.3
120,000	.2	.3	.5	.6	.9	1.0	1.1
160,000	.1	.3	.4	.6	.8	.8	1.0
200,000	.1	.2	.4	.5	.7	.8	.8
240,000	.1	.2	.4	.5	.6	.7	.8
280,000	.1	.2	.4	.4	.6	.6	.7
320,000	.1	.2	.3	.4	.6	.6	.7
360,000	.1	.2	.3	.4	.5	.6	.6
400,000	.1	.1	.3	.4	.5	.5	.6

MAPS OF CENSUS TRACTS
INCLUDED IN NEW YORK CITY UES AREA



UES area census tracts unshaded



UES area census tracts unshaded

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Middle Atlantic Regional Office
341 Ninth Avenue
New York, New York 10001

Herbert Bienstock
Regional Director

Samuel M. Ehrenhalt
Deputy Regional Director

Thomas N. Wakin
Assistant Regional Director for Operations

Alan E. Gould - Assistant to Regional Director

Joseph H. Tessler - Administrative Officer

DIVISION OF PROGRAM AND ANALYSIS

Jesse Benjamin - Chief, Branch of Program Research, Development,
and Evaluation

Seymour Ehrlich - Chief, Branch of Cooperative Programs

Morton H. Meisler - Chief, Branch of Information and
Advisory Services

DIVISION OF OPERATIONS

Alvin I. Margulis - Chief of Operations

Louise Fenstamaker - Assistant to Assistant Regional Director

Anthony J. Ferrara - Chief, Branch of Field Activities

Robert M. Findlay - Chief, Branch of Survey Methods and
Technical Review